DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 332 513 FL 019 146

AUTHOR Dixon, Richard
TITLE Listening Comprehension: Textual, Contextual, Cognitive, and Affective Considerations.
PUB DATE Mar 91
NOTE 47p.; Paper presented at the Annual Central States Conference on Language Teaching (23rd, Indianapolis, IN, March 21-24, 1991).
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143) -- Speeches/Conference Papers (150)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Advance Organizers; Classroom Research; *Cognitive Style; College Students; *Communication Apprehension; Context Clues; Higher Education; Introductory Courses; *Listening Comprehension; Multiple Choice Tests; Second Language Instruction; *Second Languages; Spanish; *Visual Aids

ABSTRACT

This study investigated the following areas: (1) the possible effects of a written textual advance organizer or contextual visual aid on foreign language (Spanish) listening comprehension; (2) variations or interactions by learning modality preference of the learner; and (3) effects attributable to either learner learning modality or foreign language class anxiety. Three independent variables (use of a contextual visual or an advance organizer in English, student learning modality, and presence of foreign language anxiety) and one dependent variable (achievement on a Spanish multiple-choice test on the listening passage used) were considered. Subjects were 198 college students in a beginning Spanish class. A 3 x 3 x 2 factorial design was used for the study. Results indicate that the students with a textual advance organizer performed better in listening comprehension than those with a visual cue or no cue. Students without anxiety scored significantly higher than those with anxiety, regardless of cue received or learning modality. Learning modality did not significantly affect learning comprehension and did not interact with either level of semantic cue. A 16-item bibliography, the textual and contextual cues, and the multiple-choice test are appended. (MSE)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED332513

Taylor University
Upland, IN 46989
Department of Modern Languages
317 998 5141

"Listening Comprehension: Textual, Contextual, Cognitive and Affective Considerations."

TEXTUAL-CONTEXTUAL

Dr. Richard Dixon
Associate Professor of Spanish
Department of Modern Languages

Office Phone: 317 - 998 - 5249

Home Address: 108 West 11th
Alexandria, In
46001

Home Phone: 317 - 724 - 9682

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R Dixon

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

FL019146

"Listening Comprehension: Textual, Contextual, Cognitive, and Affective Considerations."

INTRODUCTION

The comprehension of aural input is one of the most difficult tasks in second language acquisition. In most listening situations, the listener must decode meaning from spoken language that contains structures and cultural information which are not familiar to him/her. Foreign language educators have used textual and contextual organizers to augment students' comprehension when performing difficult listening tasks.

Bransford and Johnson first investigated the effects of contextual visual organizers on the comprehension of listening material. The information in the passage used for the experiment was straightforward in nature. However, without the prerequisite background knowledge the input was considered by the researchers as difficult to comprehend. Five groups of subjects participated in the experiment. The findings showed that only the group that received the contextual visual organizer before hearing the passage had a real advantage in comprehending it. This group scored twice as high as any of the other four groups in rating the comprehensibility of the material and also in recalling it.

Mueller duplicated Bransford and Johnson's study with native

speakers of English studying German as a second language. He researched the effects of a contextual visual organizer on listening comprehension. Mueller established that presenting a contextual visual before hearing the passage had the most beneficial effect for the students of German, especially at the lower levels of proficiency.

Ausubel established the criteria to define a textual advance organizer. According to him, an advance organizer is introduced in advance of the learning material itself and is used to facilitate establishment of a meaningful learning set. Meaningful learning is the relation of the new material to what the learner already knows. Ausubel explained that an advance organizer helps the learner recognize that elements of new learning materials can be meaningfully understood by relating them to what s/he already knows. Ausubel added that in order for an advance organizer to function for a variety of learners, it must be presented at a higher level of abstraction, generality and inclusiveness than the new material to be learned. The advance organizer, then, bridges the gap between what the learner already knows and what s/he needs to know before s/he can meaningfully comprehend the material before him/her. Ausubel conceived the advance organizer as a textual written device to

enhance reading comprehension.

The usefulness of a written textual organizer to enhance listening comprehension has not been researched yet. To this day, only two studies have been conducted but both used oral advance organizers. Bransford and Johnson measured the effects of oral textual organizers on the comprehension of ambiguous listening material. Subjects who received the topic or title of the passage before hearing it rated it more comprehensible than those in other groups. Clearly, providing a title or topic orally lacks abstraction, generality and certainly inclusiveness.

In another study Corbett and Smith used an oral textual organizer to enhance listening comprehension in subjects whose preferential mode of learning was aural. The findings did not show significant results. On the other hand, subjects who had been identified as visually oriented were not hindered because they received an oral textual organizer before performing the listening task. The textual organizer used in this study - an oral summary of the listening material - deviated from Ausubel criteria. It lacked abstraction and generality. The subjects received factual information of the content as it was.

Researchers have looked at the effects of both textual and contextual

advance organizers on reading comprehension more closely. Omaggio researched the effects of contextual visual organizers on the comprehension of both French and English material by subjects who were native speakers of English. The results showed that for subjects reading the text in English there were no significant differences in scores. The lack of significance occurred regardless of the contextual visual condition under which the text was read. On the other hand, for students reading the same text in French, the contextual visuals used as advance organizers had a significant effect. Subjects who received the contextual visual before they listened to the story had a significant advantage over all the subjects in the French textual condition.

Johnson also conducted a study with ESL readers. They read passages related to Halloween in which some of the information was familiar, but other information was not. Four groups of students received different amounts and kinds of written explanations with unknown vocabulary in the passage. Students who studied the written definitions of unfamiliar vocabulary before reading the passage were at an advantage. They were able to recall more propositions between the ideas of the passage and wrote more cohesive summaries than did subjects in the other

three groups. The written explanations used to introduce unknown vocabulary in the reading text adds inclusiveness but misses abstraction and generality.

Adams used textual advance organizers in an experiment with students of French as a second language. The subjects read texts about familiar events in a college student's life such as playing tennis, grocery shopping, doing laundry, washing dishes, and attending a wedding. For each passage, the researchers deleted a key word and replaced it with a nonsense word. The students' ability to guess the meaning of the nonsense word was manipulated through the oral provision of the passage's topic before reading took place. Her results showed that subjects who had the oral provision of the passage's topic scored much higher on vocabulary than did those who had no such advance organizer. She concluded that the oral textual organizers were most beneficial to second languagae readers with low proficiency. The use of an oral topic sentence in a target language fails the three criteria established by Ausubel in constructing an advance organizer.

Hudson was the first researcher to test the effects of textual versus contextual advance organizers on reading comprehension. The textual

organizer consisted of a vocabulary list presented before the subjects read the passage. The contextual organizer consisted of visuals relating to the general topic of the passage. The findings indicated that, at lower levels of proficiency, the provision of contextual visuals greatly aided comprehension of the test passage. A written vocabulary list meets the criterion of inclusiveness but fails the criteria of abstraction and generality.

Tanglieber and Johnson investigated the effects of three prereading activities (pictorial context, vocabulary preteaching, and prequestioning) and a control condition on the reading comprehension of undergraduate Brazilian students. All subjects read four different passages, each passage under one of the four conditions. Immediately after reading a passage, subjects answered an 8-item open-ended test and a 10-item multiple-choice test. The findings revealed that all three prereading activities produced significantly higher multiple-choice scores than the control group. Vocabulary preteaching resulted in increased comprehension compared with the control group. Vocabulary preteaching resulted in increased comprehension compared with the control group but was significantly less effective than the other two strategies. Both vocabulary preteaching and prequestioning do not meet the standards of abstraction and generality.

The studies reviewed here did not investigate the effects of a written textual advance organizer on listening comprehension. Moreover, the experiments testing the effects of a textual advance organizer on reading comprehension failed to take into account the following: 1) A textual advance organizer must have a higher degree of generality, inclusiveness, and abstraction than the material it introduces. 2) A textual advance organizer must be written.

Also, there is significant evidence that supports a relationship between academic achievement and learning modality preference. (Keefe, Dunn et al., Reinert) Yet, no control over the interactive effects of advance organizers and learning modality was exercized in any of the experiments under study.

Finally, research by Steinberg and Horwitz showed that foreign language anxiety has a debilitating effect on students' performance on a second language task. The anxiety variable, though, was not measured as a confounding factor on the outcome of any of the research dealing with the effects of either a textual or contextual advance organizer on listening or reading comprehension.

This study, then, specifically adressed the following questions: 1)

Are there any effects attributable to a written textual advance organizer on listening comprehension? 2) Are there any effects attributable to a contextual visual on listening comprehension? 3) Are there any significant interactions between the use of the written textual advance organizer and the learning modality preference of the subjects? 4) Are there any significant interactions between the use of the contextual visual and the learning modality of the subjects? 5) Are there any effects attributable to the learning modality of the subjects on measures of listening comprehension? 6) Are there any effects attributable to foreign language class anxiety on listening comprehension?

DESIGN

A 3 x 3 x 2 factorial design was selected for this study because it offers efficiency, control, high information yield, and the possibility of detecting interaction effects. This study has the following three independent variables: 1) Semantic Cue (A); 2) Learning Modality (B); 3) Foreign Language Anxiety (C) were used.

The first independent variable was a random active variable with the following three levels: 1) Contextual Cue (A_1) subjects saw the contextual

visual before hearing the entire listening passage and then recalled its contents by taking a written multiple-choice test (in Spanish) on it; 2) Textual Cue (A_2): subjects read the advance organizer (in English) before they heard the entire listening passage and then recalled its contents by taking a written multiple-choice test (in Spanish) on it; 3) No Cue (A_3): subjects listened to the entire passage then recalled its contents by taking a written multiple-choice test (in Spanish) on it, but did not receive a semantic cue (textual or contextual) at all.

The second independent variable was a fixed variable with the following three levels: 1) Visual Learning Modality (B_1): subjects learn better if they see objects and activities or read description of the event. Aural learning Modality (B_2): subjects learn better if they receive meaning from the sound of the word; and 3) Multi Learning Modality (B_3): subjects learn better if they receive visual and aural input about an event along with some kind of physical activity.

The third independent variable was a fixed variable with the following two levels: 1) Presence of Foreign Language Anxiety (C_1): subjects had developed a fear about the target language. This fear may act to inhibit the subjects' performance in this experiment; 2) Absence of

Foreign Language Anxiety (C_2): subjects had not developed a fear about the target language. Anxiety was not expected to inhibit the subjects' performance in this experiment.

This study had one dependent variable - a multiple-choice test (in Spanish) on the listening passage taken during the twelve minutes immediately following the experimental conditions. Subjects were instructed that the results of the test would not affect their course grade in any manner. They were also encouraged to hypothesize the meaning of any unfamiliar words or phrases they may encounter in the taped passage. No penalties would be levied for doing this.

POPULATION AND SAMPLE

The population from which sample subjects for this study were drawn consisted of students of beginning Spanish. This study was conducted in January of 1988 while students were enrolled in the second semester of a mandatory two-semester language sequence. There were 210 students enrolled in the nine participating classes. Absences on dates when the information was gathered or faulty use of the instruments reduced the number to 198.

The participating students were selected as the population for this study for a number of reasons. First, it was the availability of the subjects. Since all students have to take a second language, there were nine sections of Spanish 102 at the university. Second, the mean SAT verbal scores for the nine classes were almost even. This insured that there were no initial differences among the groups that could have influenced that outcome of the experiment. Third, the fact that the study was conducted as a part of regular class activity increased the external validity of the study and, in turn, allowed one to generalize the study's findings to actual instructional settings. Fourth, the language courses are administered with a high degree of standardization. All students are required to work one class period per week in the language laboratory with the class instructor. All students are required to work one class period per week in the language laboratory on his/her own.

MATERIALS

The materials used for this experiment consisted of a contextual visual, a textual advance organizer, a foreign language classroom anxiety scale, a learning style identification exercise, a taped story of approxi-

mately 200 words, and the multiple-choice instrument.

The contextual visual used in this experiment was constructed after the level of difficulty for the listening passage had been validated by cooperating professors. The drawing by a professional illustrator met the criteria of generality, inclusiveness, and abstraction. All activities central to the story were illustrated in a general manner. Subjects looking at the contextual visual would not be able to develop the story by just looking at the contextual cue. The drawing, at the same time, was also inclusive. It showed graphically the main action in the listening passage. Finally, the picture was abstract in nature. It conveyed a message of outdoor activity in a particular setting. On the other hand, it did not communicate either relationship nor purpose.

The textual advance organizer (in English) used in this study was developed to meet the criteria established by Ausubel. All references to family, sports activities, and facilities had a high level of generality. There was a high level of inclusiveness because the organizer brought to mind that most parks have many facilities. It also reminded the subjects that some people enjoy group sports, others individual sports, while others enjoy being expectators. Finally, it directed the attention of the subjects

to the fact that outdoor cooking can be an integral part of enjoying an outing at a local park. Abstraction was insured by discussing the possible activities on an outing at a park without being specific. Cooperating professors wrote their own advance organizers for the listening passage. This researcher in conjunction with them used the main components stressed in the three different drafts to construct the final textual organizer used in the experiment.

The Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale was developed by Elaine K. Horwitz, Michael B. Horwitz, and Joan Cope. The scale has demonstrated internal reliability achieving an Alpha coefficient of .93 with all items producing corrected item--total scale correlations. Test--retest reliability over eight weeks yielded an r = .83 (P .01). This instrument consists of thirty--three items. Eighteen are distractors while the remaining fifteen are reflective of communication apprehension, test anxiety, and fear of negative evaluation in the foreign language. All the items are evaluated on a continuum in which students strongly agree, neither agree or disagree, disagree, or strongly disagree with the statement.

The learning style identification instrument used was the Edmonds

Learning Style Identification Exercise. This instrument provides information on the student preferential mode of learning by asking each participant to write out an instantaneous response to a list of fifty (50) English words, when read aloud. It has been established that upon hearing a word a person will have one of the following four reactions:

1) a mental image of an object or activity (Visualization);
2) a mental image of the word spelled out (Written Word);
3) the decoding of meaning from the sound of the word without visualization (Listening);
4) the experience of a fleeting kinesthetic reaction, either emotional or physical (Activity).

The reliability of the Edmonds Learning Style Identification Exercise was initially tested among nearly 1,000 individuals at grade levels ranging from junior high school to graduate school. An item analysis was conducted to compare the performance of individuals who had taken the test twice. The results showed that each student had identical responses on more than 70 percent of the items for both takings of the exercise. Finally, many of the subject said that they discovered that they could not

really force a pre-determined response.

The story heard in the experiment met the following criteria: 1) authentic use of language; 2) material (content and language) appropriate for second semester beginning Spanish listening task; 3) material that would be suitable for listening comprehension without the use of a visual; 4) material that approximates authentic real life listening.

The instrument used to measure the dependent variable--listening comprehension-was a fourteen item multiple-choice test in Spanish, constructed by the researcher. In order to insure an Alpha reliability coefficient of at least .70 a pilot study was conducted on January of 1987. The data gathered was submitted to a reliability analysis, and the results yielded a 0.76 coefficient.

PROCEDURES

Because this study was intentionally designed to be consistent with ongoing instruction in beginning Spanish classes, subjects were assigned to experimental conditions as follows:

1. The nine intact classes were randomly assigned by lot to each one of the three levels of the semantic cue: Contextual Cue, Textual

Cue, and No Cue.

2. After identifying the learning modality of each participant through the Edmonds Learning Style Identification Exercise, each subject in the nine intact classes was assigned to one of the three levels of learning modality: Visual Learning Modality, Aural Learning Modality, and Multi-learning Modality.

3. After identifying presence or absence of foreign language anxiety in each participant through the Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety Scale Test, each subject in the nine intact classes was assigned to one of the two levels of foreign language anxiety: presence of it and absence of it.

The experiment was conducted during regularly scheduled class meetings. Subjects were instructed to listen to the taped message (only once) and then to take a multiple-choice test (in Spanish) of its contents. Instructions to the subjects were both written and taped. Where appropriate, the contextual visual was shown on an overhead projector for 45 seconds. Students were told that the picture and the passage they were about to hear were related. Immediately after the subjects were given twelve minutes to complete the comprehension test. Where appropriate,

the textual advance organizer (in English) was handed out to participants. Subjects were instructed to read it silently for 45 seconds. Students were told that the textual organizer would prepare them for the listening passage they were about to hear. The subjects then were given twelve minutes to complete the comprehension test. To ensure standardized procedures across all experimental listening, when to begin taking the test, and when to stop.

ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

One important question in this experiment was to find out the effect of the three levels of the Semantic Cue on listening comprehension. A post hoc pairwise comparison of means was used to help interpret the significant difference existing among the three means. Because the three cell sizes (number of subjects) differed, it was necessary to use the Schaffe post hoc comparison procedure.

From Table I it is seen that the groups that received the Textual Advance Organizer scored higher than did the other two groups. However, there was no difference between the groups that viewed the Contextual Cue and the groups that received No Cue.

Insert TABLE I here

Table II provides summary statistics for the outcome measure for each of the 18 cells of the design. Cell sizes varied from three (3) to eighteen (18) subjects in each cell. This variance was caused by the effect of the learning modality of the students. The smallest mean score was 5.8 and appeared in one cell. (In that cell auditory oriented students saw a contextual cue before listening to the passage.) There were only three (3) subjects in the cell which had a 5.03 standard deviation from the mean. There were only seven (7) students in the cell which had a 1.00 standard deviation from the mean. In the other cells, the difference between the smallest standard deviation (1.77) and the highest standard deviation (4.37) suggested a rather homogeneous sample group.

Insert TABLE II here.

Table III provides summary statistics for the mean marginal scores and the total number of subjects for each of the three independent variables when combining all levels of the remaining two independent variables.

Insert TABLE III here.

The following F statistics found in Table IV showed that interaction did not exist:

1) among the variables Semantic Cue, Learning Modality, and Foreign Language Class Anxiety (F 4, 180 = 0.38, P .823);

2) between the Semantic Cue and Learning Modality (F 4, 180 = 1.38, P .241);

3) between Foreign Language Class Anxiety and Learning Modality (F 2, 180 = 1.02, P .364);

4) between Foreign Language Class Anxiety and Semantic Cue (F 2, 180 = 1.35, P .262).

Next, it was necessary to control for the confounding effects that Learning Modality or Foreign Language Class Anxiety may have had on the outcome of the experiment. Table IV shows that Learning modality did not have any effect on the results (F2, 180 = 1.93, P .148); but Foreign Language Class Anxiety did (F1, 180 = 11.98, P .001).

Insert TABLE IV here.

SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

There was a significant difference between the semantic cue group means at the .05 level of significance. For these groups, the Textual group (a written advance organizer in English) scored significantly higher than did the Contextual (visual) group and the No Cue group. The results supported the hypothesis made at the beginning of the study that a textual advance organizer constructed at a higher level of generality, inclusiveness, and abstraction than the listening material would yield significance. Because Ausubel's criteria could not be met in the target language, the textual organizer was written in English. The fact that the contextual cue did not produce significance was not unusual. As Mueller and others have indicated, the effects of a contextual visual on listening comprehension have been signficant when supporting less proficient students. The sample used in this experiment was a rather homogeneous group, hence, the results here did not contradict the outcome of other experiments.

The findings also show a significant difference between the Foreign Language Class Anxiety group means at the .05 level of significance. For these groups, the ones who did not experience anxiety scored significantly higher than the ones that did experience anxiety. This happened

regardless of the Semantic Cue received or the learning modality exhibited. These findings are in concert with positions held by other researchers in the field. Krashen pointed out that anxiety would have a debilitating effect on any comprehension task. Gardner and Smythe established that higher levels of foreign language anxiety resulted in lower achievement in students of French.

The present study did not seek to establish the effects of foreign language anxiety on the global task of second language acquisition. On the other hand, in a listening task such as the one used in this study, it was possible that anxiety could influence the final outcome of the experiment. For that reason, it was necessary to determine if an interaction took place between anxiety and measures of listening comprehension by the students.

Finally, learning modalilty did not cause significant effects on measures of listening comprehension. It did not interact with either level of the semantic cue. The expectation was that the Textual Cue would benefit aurally-oriented participants and the Contextual Cue would benefit the visually-oriented subjects. This notion was not supported by the findings. As Corbett and Smith warned, the Edmond's Learning Style

Identification Exercise seems consistent and interpretable for the individual student but it loses power when applied to groups in aptitude by treatment analysis.

In conclusion, more research is needed to find out if there is any interaction effect between the language proficiency of the students and Foreign Language Class Anxiety. Also, more studies need to investigate if textual advance organizers have similar effects on the comprehension of more abstractly presented listening materials. Finally, further research need to investigate if advance organizers costructed in the target language enhance listening comprehension at higher levels of proficiency.

NOTES

1. F is the test statistic that is the ratio of explained variance (between groups) to unexplained variance (within groups).
2. P is a probability value that measures the likelihood that a test-statistic value could occur by chance, given that the null hypothesis is true.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Adams, Shirley J. "Scripts and Recognition of Unfamiliar Vocabulary: Enhancing Second Language Reading Skills." *Modern Language Journal* 66 (1982): 155-159.

2. Ausubel, David P. *Educational Psychology: A Cognitive View.* New York: Holt, Rinehart and Winston, 1968.

3. Bransford, John D. & Marcia K. Johnson. "Contextual Prerequisites for Understanding: Some Investigations of Comprehension Recall." *Journal of Verbal Learning and Verbal Behavior II* (1972): 717-726.

4. Corbett, S. & W. F. Smith. "Identifying Student's Learning Styles: Proceed with Caution!" *Modern Language Journal* 68 (1984): 212-221.

5. Dunn, R., K. Dunn, & G. Price. *Teaching Students Through Their Individual Learning Styles.* Reston, Virginia: Reston Publishing, 1978.

6. Gardner, R. & P. Smythe. *Acquisition: A Social Psychological Approach*. London, Canada: Research Bulletin No. 332, Department of Psychology, University of Western Ontario, 1975.

7. Horwitz, Elaine, Michael B. Horwitz, & Joan Cope. "Foreign Language Classroom Anxiety." *Modern Language Journal* 70 (1986): 125-132.

8. Hudson, Thom. "The Effects of Induced Schemata on the 'Short Circuit' in L2 Reading: Non Decoding Factors in L2 Reading Performance." *Language Learning* 32 (1982): 1-31.

9. Johnson, Patricia. "Effects on Reading Comprehension of Building Background Knowledge." *TESOL Quarterly* 16 (1982): 503-516.

10. Keefe, J. W. "Learning Style: An Overview." *Student Learning Styles: Diagnosis and Prescribing Progress*, Ed. J. W. Keefe. Reston, Virginia: National Association of Secondary School Principals, 1979.

11. Krashen, Stephen. *Principles and Practice in Second Language Acquisition*. New York: Pergamon Press, 1982.

12. Mueller, Gunther A. "Visual Contextual Cues and Listening Comprehension: An Experiment." *Modern Language Journal* 64 (1980): 335-340.

13. Omaggio, Alice. "Pictures and Second Language Comprehension: Do They Help?" *Foreign Language Annals* 12 (1979): 107-116.

14. Reinert, H. "One Picture is Worth a Thousand Words? Not Necessarily." *Modern Language Journal* 60 (1976): 160-168.

15. Steinberg F. & E. Horwitz. "The Effect of Induced Anxiety on the Denotative and Interpretive Context on Second Language Speech." *TESOL Quarterly* 20 (1986): 131-136.

16. Tanglieber, L. K. & L. Johnson. "Effects of Prereading Activities on EFL Reading by Brazilian College Students." *TESOL Quarterly* 22 (1988): 455-472.

TEXTUAL-CONTEXTUAL 32

APPENDIX I TABLES

TABLE I

Results of Scheffe Post Hoc Pairwise Comparisons of Total Means for the Three Levels of the Semantic Cue

Comparison	Difference	Critical Value (=.05)
Textual Semantic Cue Vs Contextual Semantic Cue	2.1*	1.19
Textual Semantic Cue Vs No Cue	1.9*	1.24
No Cue Vs Contextual Semantic Cue	0.2	1.24

*There is a difference at the .05 level of significance.

TABLE II

Sample sizes, Means and Standard Deviations for Total Score by the Independent Variables Foreign Language Class Anxiety, Semantic Cues, and Learning Modality

			N	X	S
FLCA = 1	SC = 1	LM = 1	10	8.5	2.70
		LM = 2	18	7.8	3.23
		LM = 3	11	9.4	3.07
	SC = 2	LM = 1	12	10.5	2.24
		LM = 2	12	10.2	1.99
		LM = 3	7	11.0	1.00
	SC = 3	LM = 1	10	8.3	1.77
		LM = 2	9	10.4	2.92
		LM = 3	14	9.0	3.35
FLCA = 2	SC = 1	LM = 1	10	7.7	3.02
		LM = 2	11	5.8	2.86
		LM = 3	10	8.7	3.94

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

TABLE III

Marginal Mean of Total Score for each of the Independent Variables Semantic Cue, Learning Modality and Foreign Language Anxiety

		N	X
SC (Semantic Cue)	= 1 (Contextual)	70	7.93
	= 2 (Textual)	70	10.01
	= 3 (No Cue)	58	8.09
LM (Learning Modality)	= 1 (Visual)	68	8.78
	= 2 (Auditory)	73	8.19
	= 3 (Multiple)	57	9.30
FLCA (Foreign Language Class Anxiety)	= 1 (Absent)	104	9.27
	= 2 (Present)	94	8.10

TABLE IV

Analysis of Variance Source Table for the Dependent Measure Total Score and the Independent Variables Learning Modality, Semantic Cue, and Foreign Language Class Anxiety.

Source	MS	df	F	P
LM/ SC, FLCA	15.59	2	1.93	.148
SC/ LM, FLCA	104.39	2	12.94	.000
FLCA/ LM, SC	96.61	1	11.98	.001
LM X SC/ All one-way and remaining two-way sources	11.16	4	1.38	.241
LM X FLCA/All one-way and remaining two-way sources	8.20	2	1.02	.364

CONTINUED ON NEXT PAGE

CONTINUED FROM TABLE IV

SC X FLCA/ All one-way and remaining two-way sources	10.87	2	1.35	.262
LM X SC X FLCA/ All other sources	3.07	4	0.38	.823
Within (error = residual)	8.06	180		

NOTE

The Symbol "/" denotes a conditional test where the effect preceding the "/" is tested having controlled for the effects listed after the "/".

APPENDIX II LISTENING PASSAGE

A la familia Ramírez le gustan mucho los deportes. Todos los sábados, los padres y sus tres hijos van a un parque que está cerca de su casa. Ellos prefieren este parque porque muy pocas personas lo visitan. Allí también hay muchas facilidades para practicar sus deportes favoritos. El señor y la señora juegan al tenis. Ellos se divierten mucho porque los dos saben jugar muy bien. El esposo juega mejor y gana todos los partidos y también hace mucho sol, por eso, la señora quiere sentarse.

Mientras los señores Ramírez están sentados, ellos miran a sus tres hijos en acción. Julio, que tiene 18 años, practica el básquetbol. El nunca pierde la oportunidad de practicarlo. El quiere ser el mejor jugador de su equipo. Ana, la única hija delos Ramírez tiene 16 años y juega con su amiga María. Las dos son amigas desde que eran niñas. Ya hace mucho tiempo que ellas juegan al tenis.

El niño José, que tiene ocho años, no se precupa por el resto de la familia. El está muy interesado en su trompo. A él no le interesan los otros deportes.

Como es la una de la tarde, el papá y la mamá deciden que es hora de comer el almuerzo. Ellos van al automóvil y traen la comida y los refrescos. Inmediatamente llaman a sus hijos para que coman el almuerzo. Ellos no quieren comer. Prefieren continuar lo que están haciendo.

Translation of the Listening Passage

The Ramirez family likes sports very much. Every Saturday, kthe parents and their three children go to a park which is near their house. They prefer that park because not many people visit it. There are also many facilities to practice their favorite sports. Mr. and Mrs. Ramirez play tennis. They have lots of fun because both of them play well. The husband play better than Mrs. Ramirez and he wins all the matches. It is very sunny also, therefore, Mrs. Ramirez wants to sit down.

While the Ramirezes are sitting, they watch their three children in action. Julio, who is 18 years old, practices basketball. He never misses the opportunity to do it. He wants to become the best player on his team. Ana, the Ramirezes' only daughter, who is sixteen, plays with her friend Maria. The two have been friends since they were young girls. They

have played tennis for a long time.

José the young boy, who is eight years old, is not paying any attention to the rest of the family. He is very interested in his top. He is not interested in other sports.

Since it is one o'clock, the Ramirezes decide that it is time to have lunch. They go to the car and bring the food and the drinks. Immedately, they call their children to have lunch. They do not want to eat. They prefer to continue in what they are doing.

APPENDIX III MULTIPLE-CHOICE RECALL MEASURE INSTRUMENT

1. _____Los Ramírez a) son aficionados a los deportes. b) están aburridos de los deportes. c) miran los deportes. d) tienen poco interés en los deportes.
2. _____La familia visita el parque durante a) el principio. b) la mitad. c) el fin. d) el principio y el fin; de semana.
3. _____Cuando los Ramírez visitan el parque a) hay poca gente. b) hay mucha gente. c) abunda la gente. d) entra mucha gente.
4. _____En el parque a) no practican los deportes. b) practican muchos deportes. c) se juega poco. d) hay actividad deportiva limitada.
5. _____El señor Ramírez a) juega con Julio. b) juega con unos amigos. c) juega con la señora Ramírez. d) juega con Ana.

6. _____Cuando el señor y la señora Ramírez juegan

a) ella gana. b) nadie gana. c) los dos ganan. d) el gana.

7. _____Después de jugar al tenir la señor Ramírez

quiere a) contentarse. b) sentarse. c) cansarse. d) aburrirse.

8. _____Los Ramírez contemplan a sus hijos cuando

ellos a) juegan. b) descansan. c) se sientan. d) se levantan.

9. _____El hijo mayor de la familia a) practica

de vez en cuando. b) practica poco. c) casi nunca practica. d) practica todo el tiempo.

10. _____Julio quiere ser un Jugador

a) desconocido. b) interesante. c) excelente. d) aburrido.

11. _____Ana es a) mayor que Julio b) menor que

José. c) de la misma edad que Julio. d) menor que Julio.

12. _____Ana y sus padres practican a) el vólibol.

b) el básquetbol. c) el tenis. d) el béisbol.

13. _____Ana se divierte mucho con a) su mejor

amiga. b) el amiga de sus padres. c) al amiga de José. d) la amiga de Pablo.

14. _____Ana a) tiene dos hermanas. b) no tiene hermana. c) tiene una hermana. d) tiene tres hermanas.

15. _____Ana y María a) no son buenas amigas. b) son amigas nuevas. c) son muy buenas amigas. d) son amigas así así.

16. _____José es a) mayor que Ana. b) menor que Julio y Ana. c) menor que Ana pero mayor que Julio. d) mayor que Julio y Ana.

17. _____José prefiere jugqar a) con sus padres. b) con Julio. c) solo. d) con María y Ana.

18. _____A la una de la tarde los Ramírez dicen a los niños que es hora de a) comer. b) volver. c) jugar. d) descansar.

20. _____Los niños prefieren a) comer. b) descansar. c) sentarse. d) practicar los deportes.

APPENDIX IV: CONTEXTUAL CUE